

Post PRINT VERSION

To cite *print* version:

Zawisza, M., Luyt, R., & Zawadzka, A.M. (2013). Societies in transition: are they more sexist? A comparison between Polish, South African and British samples. *Journal of Gender Studies*, (ahead-of-print), 1-18. doi:10.1080/09589236.2013.803952

Societies in transition: are they more sexist? A comparison between Polish, South African and British samples

Abstract

This study investigates ambivalent sexism to women in student samples from two under-researched transitional countries, Poland and South Africa, in comparison with the United Kingdom. Based on ambivalent sexism theory, and in the light of socio-economic context, it was hypothesized that: (1) the sample in Poland and South Africa would be more hostile- and benevolent-sexist than the sample from the UK, (2) males would exhibit more hostile attitudes than females irrespective of country, and (3) males would outscore females on benevolent attitudes in the relatively liberal UK but underscore them in relatively conservative SA. The Ambivalent Sexism Inventory was used to measure benevolent and hostile sexism. The findings largely supported the hypotheses. The participants in South Africa and Poland were more sexist than in the UK and men were more hostile-sexist than women in all three countries. However, males outscored females on benevolent sexism not only in the UK but also in South Africa and Poland. Moreover, the sample from Poland was observed to be more sexist than the sample from South Africa. The findings are discussed in the light of ambivalent sexism theory and the countries' transitional context.

Keywords: ambivalent sexism, gender attitudes, transition to democracy, Poland, South Africa, United Kingdom

Societies in transition: are they more sexist? A comparison between Polish, South African and British samples

A great deal of research has examined gender attitudes cross-nationally (see Williams and Best 1982, Williams *et al.* 1999, Glick *et al.* 2004), and, in particular, attitudes toward women (see Tougas *et al.* 1995, Glick and Fiske 1996, Glick *et al.* 2000, Twenge 2001, Swim and Campbell 2003). However, with a few exceptions, this research has neglected study of gender attitudes in ‘transitional’ (see below) countries such as those from Central and Eastern Europe (CEE) (for example Poland *et al.* 1999) and Africa (for example, South Africa, Glick *et al.* 2000). In addition, the research has largely understood gender attitudes as a global construct, failing to distinguish between hostile (HS) and benevolent (BS) sexism (that is overt negativity and evaluatively positive but patronizing attitudes to women; see Glick and Fiske 1996). Importantly, a discussion of how the dynamic socio-cultural context of transitional countries may influence the manifestation of sexism has been neglected. The aim of this paper is to address these gaps in the literature by examining both hostile and benevolent sexism to women in transitional Poland (PL) and South Africa (SA) in contrast to the relatively socio-politically stable UK.

Poland and SA were specifically selected as they have undergone socio-economic and political transition during the same period after an interval of economic and political isolation. Importantly, however, these countries differed in the emphasis afforded gender issues during transition. The term ‘transition’, when applied to countries, traditionally refers to instances characterized by constitutional reform including market-oriented changes (Falke 2002). While this normally involves movement from a centrally-planned to a free-market economy (Cameron 2003) – as seen, for example, in CEE countries – it can also be observed in post-colonial or post-authoritarian systems (Falke 2002). Thus, transition can include

1 profound political reform within an already existing free-market economy, as was the case in
2 South Africa (Cameron 2003). According to Burgess and Steenkamp (1999, p.2) in SA:

3 (t)here are clear parallels to the situation in Eastern Europe. In the former communist
4 countries there was also a clear distinction between the elite (i.e., Communist Party members)
5 and the majority of the population. In Eastern Europe, economic and political freedom of the
6 majority of the population was also severely restricted. Moreover, the concentration in South
7 Africa of economic power in a few hands is in important respects similar to (pretransition)
8 Eastern Europe.

9 Of specific relevance here, and despite these similarities, varying emphasis was afforded
10 gender issues in SA and PL during their respective transitions. A comparison of these
11 provides a unique opportunity to analyze how the nature of transition – a history of legalized
12 inequality in SA as against the forced emancipation of communism in PL – may shape the
13 manifestation of benevolent and hostile sexism among men and women.

14 Our analysis goes beyond the predictions of Ambivalent Sexism Theory (AST, Glick
15 and Fiske 1996, Glick *et al.* 2000). This theory assumes that the origins of HS and BS are
16 biological (sexual dimorphism) and social (patriarchy) where the former lead to the latter and
17 result in ambivalent sexism cross-culturally (Glick *et al.* 2000). AST does acknowledge that

18 (t)he degree of hostile as compared with benevolent sexism may vary widely among societies
19 (from those in which women are treated as chattel to those dominated by an ideology of
20 chivalry) [...]’ (Glick and Fiske 1996, p.492).

21 Yet, it does not provide a clear account as to why levels of patriarchy (and thus sexism) differ
22 cross-culturally. For example, the authors do not test for possible significant differences in
23 sexisms between countries and, instead, focus more narrowly on the correlations between HS
24 and BS within countries. We also attempt to move beyond modernization theories. These
25 propose that technological advancements, and related economic changes, may result in
26 altered moral and cultural values, for example, greater gender liberalism (Inglehart and Norris

2003). Specifically, we argue that despite modernization having taken place during the same period in each country, the degree of gender liberalism differs, as mentioned above, as a consequence of the varying emphasis afforded to gender issues in each.

Our analysis thus focuses on two key questions: (1) what is the level of hostile and benevolent sexism in PL and SA as compared to that in the UK, and (2), how do men compare to women concerning their benevolent and hostile sexist attitudes toward women in each of the three countries? Additionally, our data will enable indirect confirmation of previous findings reporting the UK's relative gender egalitarianism and SA's relative gender conservatism (Glick *et al.* 2000), as well as provide an examination of potential changes over time across these two countries.

The manifestation of sexism toward women around the world

According to AST (Glick *et al.* 2000), sexist gender attitudes are ambivalent as they consist of two complementary and positively related ideologies: Hostile Sexism (HS) defined as 'an adversarial view of gender relations in which women are perceived as seeking to control men' (Glick and Fiske 2001, p. 109) and Benevolent Sexism (BS) defined as positive but still patronising beliefs about women (Glick and Fiske 2001). The function of both types of sexism serves hierarchy stabilization and therefore the maintenance of gender inequality (Glick and Fiske 2001, Sibley *et al.* 2007a, Becker 2010). Egalitarian gender attitudes, on the other hand, reflect ideologies which promote gender equality (McDaniel 2008). Cross-national research on ambivalent sexism reveals a 'regional' pattern: out of 19 countries, Australia, England, the Netherlands, and the United States where amongst the least sexist whilst Botswana, Cuba, Nigeria, and SA scored most sexist (Glick *et al.* 2000). In addition, gender inequality, as assessed by the Gender Empowerment Measure (GEM) and the Gender-Related Development Index (GDI), correlates with HS and BS and is highest amongst the

latter group of countries (Glick *et al.* 2000).

However, the findings concerning SA are now more than 10 years old, and they have also never been systematically compared against PL. Due to the similarities and differences in their respective transitions we argue that varied levels of benevolent and hostile sexism will be observed in these two countries. The UK, on the other hand, may not be considered a country undergoing, or recently having undergone, transition. That is to say, its relatively stable democratic political system has spanned some 300 years in comparison to PL and SA's mere 20. It is also well-researched and has consistently scored amongst the most egalitarian countries worldwide (Williams and Best 1990, Glick *et al.* 2000, Glick *et al.* 2004). The UK has therefore been included in this study as a useful benchmark against which the less well-researched transitional countries of PL and SA may be compared. It should, however, be acknowledged that levels of gender equalitarianism in the UK are exceeded in North European countries. While there is lack of research testing (ambivalent) sexism in countries such as Iceland, Finland, Norway or Sweden they consistently score as the most egalitarian countries worldwide on various gender equality indices (Brandt and Henry 2012, Prewitt-Freilino *et al.* 2012).

Comparing Sexist Attitudes toward Women in PL, SA and the UK

Given the aforementioned correlation between both GEM and GDI with ambivalent sexism (Glick *et al.* 2000), it is arguable that sexism in the three countries might be predicted on the basis of such indices (Glick *et al.* 2000). However, whilst the most recent GEM analysis ranks the UK as most egalitarian (15th worldwide, 0.79), followed by SA (26th worldwide, 0.687) and then PL (38th worldwide, 0.631), the last GDI analysis ranks the UK as most egalitarian (17th worldwide, 0.943), followed by PL (39th worldwide, 0.877) and then SA (109th worldwide, 0.680) (Glick *et al.* 2000, 'United Nations Development Programme', 2009). These inconsistencies may partly be explained by the different aspects of equality that

they measure. But they may also indicate the complexities and variability in gender attitudes typical of societies in transition (Bhana *et al.* 2008). Indeed, the only country out of the three, which scores consistently highly on both socio-economic and psychological measures of egalitarianism is the relatively socio-economically stable and non-transitional UK.

Notably, the UK is also considered to be amongst the most developed countries in the world. Modernization manifests itself in numerous ways, including for example, industrialisation, technological sophistication, economic development, etc. This is argued to be related to higher levels of gender equality (Williams and Best 1990, Inglehart and Norris 2003). The feminist movement in the UK dates back to approximately the early 1800s¹.

However, considerable reduction in egalitarian trends since the early 1980s is reported by some commentators in the UK (Blau *et al.* 2006, Scott 2006, Dorius and Alwin 2010) while others even debate the possibility of trend reversal or a return to sexism (Crompton *et al.* 2005, Braun and Scott 2009, Walter 2010).

How does the UK compare to SA and PL in terms of sexist attitudes? Although, given the above, the level of egalitarianism in the UK might have decreased since Glick *et al.*'s (2000) first results, it is reasonable to expect that it is still significantly more egalitarian than SA and, possibly, PL. SA scored amongst the most conservative countries in earlier cross-national research concerning ambivalent sexism (Glick *et al.* 2000). A recent study involving young Mixed race and Black males from a South African township reports between 50-80% agreement with the Hostile Sexism scale (Kalichman *et al.* 2007).

¹It should be noted here that full women's suffrage was not achieved until 1928 as compared to 1918 in PL. In SA suffrage was initially granted to White women in 1930 and was fully extended to include Black women in 1994.

Existing evidence for greater egalitarianism of the UK compared to PL is of an indirect nature only. The few cross-national studies which include CEE countries and use gender attitude measures (Frieze *et al.* 2003, Levant *et al.* 2003, Shafiro *et al.* 2003) have demonstrated their greater gender conservatism as compared to Western nations. However, such studies largely neglect consideration of PL. Few studies have compared PL to other CEE countries, and those which have (Forbes *et al.* 2004, Robila and Krishnakumar 2004, Olson *et al.* 2007), suggest that PL ranks relatively moderately on measures of gender attitudes and equality. To the best of our knowledge, only one cross-national study included PL and assessed both hostile and benevolent attitudes toward women using the Ambivalent Sexism Inventory (ASI, Glick and Fiske 1996). It reported higher sexism in Polish than in American students (Forbes *et al.* 2004). However, Forbes *et al.*'s (2004) study included only female participants. Existing research indicates that the UK scores similarly to the USA on HS and lower on BS (Glick *et al.* 2000). Therefore, taken together, and along with modernization theories, the studies by Forbes *et al.* (2004) and Glick *et al.* (2000) suggest that, similarly to SA, PL will score as more sexist than the UK.

The question concerning how PL and SA compare to each other is more difficult to answer due to a paucity of research. These countries are described as societies in transition; both underwent long struggles for independence, dynamic socio-economic changes, and represent relatively young democratic systems established in the early 1990s following intervals of economic and political isolation (Burgess and Steenkamp 1999, Grodsky 2011). One could predict a comparable level of sexism in these countries based on modernization theories (Inglehart and Norris 2003) and, as mentioned above, AST is underspecified in this regard. Yet, as already noted, our analysis allows us to go beyond these theories and to make more precise predictions concerning the manifestation of ambivalent sexism in each country.

1 In SA's case, transition toward democracy, seen in the movement from apartheid to
2 majority political rule after democratic elections in 1994, resulted in gender equality concerns
3 being placed at the centre of democratisation debates (Andrews 2001, Jagwanth and Murray
4 2002, Hassim 2002, 2004). Greater legal and political equality for women resulted from
5 direct feminist participation in the processes of transition (Hassim 2005); even though some
6 claim that democratization has ushered only moderate improvement in equality at grassroots
7 level (Hassim 2004). PL's transition toward democracy was quite distinct from that of SA.
8 Idealist Marxist-Leninist theories of women's equality informed communist values
9 (Yakushko 2005). This apparent egalitarianism in the public sphere was, however, not
10 accompanied by equality in the domestic sphere (Shafiro *et al.* 2003). Polish women
11 experienced the so-called 'triple burden' – the roles of worker, mother and social activist
12 (LaFont 2001). Transition toward patriarchal democracy in 1989 was marked therefore by a
13 rejection of communist ideals. This included denunciation of previously politically fostered
14 ideologies of women's emancipation. Reinforcement of the ideals of motherhood and the
15 remasculinisation of society resulted in the loss of egalitarian gains made under the
16 communist dispensation (Wall *et al.* 1999, LaFont 2001, Pollert 2003, Yakushko 2005,
17 Seguíno 2007). Polish feminist movements continue to be less well established than those in
18 most Western countries as well as, notably, SA (Rosner 1997, LaFont 2001, Ksiniewicz
19 2004).

20 Conflicting factors are thus at work in PL but perhaps less so in SA. The process of
21 modernization (Inglehart and Norris 2003) and liberal individualism promoted by
22 (patriarchal) capitalism (Gibbons *et al.* 1991) both facilitate more liberal gender roles in PL
23 as well as in SA. However, while women's issues were central to the democratization process
24 in SA (Hassim 2004) they were marginalized in PL (LaFont 2001, Pollert 2003, Seguíno

2007). This analysis suggests greater likely development of egalitarianism in SA than in PL over the same period.

Given that, according to AST (Glick and Fiske 1996), HS and BS are two complementary facets of traditional gender ideology, we expect that PL and SA will score as significantly more sexist than the UK on both HS (H1a) and BS (H1b). We also predict that, due to their specific histories of transition, PL will score higher than SA on both HS (H1c) and BS (H1d). While the former two hypotheses are based on previous cross-cultural research on AST, the latter two go beyond the theory, and are based on our argument as outlined above. Importantly, however, AST suggests that men and women may score differently on specific forms of sexism within each country.

Gender differences in sexist attitudes in PL, SA and the UK

Cross-national evidence implies that women are more liberal in their gender attitudes than men. This was shown in 14 countries drawn from across North and South America, Africa, Europe, and Asia (except for Malaysia and Pakistan, Williams and Best 1990) as well as for CEE in terms of overall gender equality (Olson *et al.* 2007) and attitudes toward women (Frieze *et al.* 2003, Levant *et al.* 2003).

The picture is more complex with regard to ambivalent attitudes and depends on the type of sexism. According to AST the two forms of sexism (HS and BS) hold different meaning for men and women (Glick and Fiske 2001, Viki and Abrams 2004, Sibley *et al.* 2007b, Sibley and Perry 2010). HS is overtly negative to women and threatens their in-group interest directly. For men, on the other hand, HS is motivated by the need to protect their in-group interests (dominance) against the supposed threat to their power by women (Sibley *et al.* 2007b). Thus, endorsing HS protects male in-group interests, whilst rejecting it protects female in-group interests. This leads to a gender difference in HS, with men outscoring

1 women (H2a). Such a main gender effect on HS was seen in all 19 countries examined by
2 Glick *et al.* (2000).

3 The case of gender differences on BS is different. While the two types of sexism share
4 the belief that women are weak and dependent upon men, they differ in that BS offers the
5 unique promise of men's protection so long as women do not challenge the status quo (Viki
6 and Abrams 2004). In everyday life, BS may be perceived as positive and therefore many fail
7 to see its inherent sexism (Barreto and Ellemers 2005). However, BS has been shown to
8 bolster HS (Sibley *et al.* 2007a). Even if women recognize the ill-effects of BS, they may be
9 motivated to embrace it as it offers protection from HS – particularly in highly sexist contexts
10 (Sibley *et al.* 2007a) or '[...] in times of intense social threat [...], especially when alternative
11 sources of power and resources are not readily available' (Sibley *et al.* 2007, p. 745). Glick
12 and colleagues (Glick *et al.* 2000, Glick and Fiske 2001) similarly argue that in highly sexist
13 countries women depend on men to a greater degree and the consequences of them
14 challenging the status quo are more severe. This suggests that women in particular may
15 embrace BS especially strongly in less egalitarian countries such as SA and PL.

16 Men, on the other hand, may be motivated to endorse BS to a greater extent in more
17 egalitarian countries. In intimate relations, dominant groups are often seen to apply
18 paternalistic ideologies, such as BS, to subordinates alongside hostile ones, as they serve as
19 an effective tool of social control (Jackman 1994, Sibley *et al.* 2009). BS defines and justifies
20 women's subordinate position and maintains their acquiescence by 'sweetening the deal' –
21 offering a reward (such as social acceptance) for conforming to the status quo and thus
22 reducing the need for combative HS. However, the less egalitarian a country, the more men
23 'may be likely to endorse HS directly, without the need for BS to function as a legitimizing
24 [...] expressions of HS [...]' (Sibley *et al.* 2007b, p. 170). The need for men's expression of

1 BS increases along with greater gender egalitarianism as expressing HS becomes socially
2 inappropriate.

3 So, according to AST, unlike in the case of HS where men and women have opposing
4 motivations to respectively embrace or reject it, in the case of BS both men and women are
5 motivated to embrace it. However, women's motivation increases along with greater levels of
6 sexism in a country, while men's motivation increases along with lower levels of sexism.
7 This suggests that in gender conservative countries, such as SA, women should outscore men
8 on BS (H2b) while in gender egalitarian countries, such as the UK, it is men who may
9 embrace BS to a greater extent than women (H2c). Indeed, in line with the theory, in 19
10 nations, including SA and the UK, men consistently expressed HS to a greater extent than
11 women (Glick *et al.* 2000). Findings concerning BS were, however, more varied. Whilst in
12 some, mainly egalitarian, countries (such as Australia, England, and the USA) men rated
13 higher on BS than women, in other, more sexist countries (such as Cuba, Nigeria, or SA), it
14 was women who outscored men. Masser and Abrams (1999) and Viki and Abrams (2003)
15 also consistently showed that British men outscored women on both HS and BS.

16 CEE countries were not included in Glick *et al.*'s (2000) study. Yakushko (2005)
17 nonetheless reports that Ukrainian women embraced BS to a greater extent than men; this is
18 typical of less gender egalitarian countries. However, these findings diverge from Glick *et*
19 *al.*'s (2000) cross-national research in that no significant gender differences were found on
20 HS. The only study measuring HS and BS through the use of the ASI in PL tested only
21 females and therefore does not explore gender differences (Forbes *et al.* 2004). Based on this
22 empirical literature it is unclear therefore what gender differences will emerge in PL.
23 However, if PL is the most conservative of the three countries, as argued previously, then a
24 pattern typical of conservative countries should emerge where Polish women outscore Polish
25 men on BS (H2d).

Method

Participants

Student participants were recruited through means such as campus leaflets and e-mails. They were offered remuneration for their time.

Sample 1: United Kingdom. One hundred and twenty-six British undergraduate students (40% females and 60% males) from Royal Holloway, University of London and The University of Winchester participated. Forty non-British participants were removed from an initial sample of 166 participants. British participants averaged 22.13 years of age, ranging from 18 to 48 years old ($sd=5.85$). Ninety-two percent identified as White, followed by 3% Mixed, 2% Black, 2% Asian and 1% of other ethnic origin. Most studied social sciences and the arts (76.2%), followed by joint programmes (12.7%), science (5.6%), and unknown subjects (5.6%).

Sample 2: Poland. One hundred and twenty-seven Polish students (50% females and 50% males) from Gdansk University participated. They averaged 22.13 years of age, ranging from 19 to 29 years old ($sd=2.30$). All participants were White and the majority were recruited from the psychology and arts departments (83.5%), whilst the remaining studied science (12.6%), joint programmes (3.1%), and unknown subjects (0.8%).

Sample 3: South Africa. One hundred and seventy-five South African students (56% females and 44% males) from the University of Cape Town participated. They averaged 19.82 years of age, ranging from 17 to 34 years old ($sd=2.14$). Fifty-five percent identified as White, 11.4% as Asian, 17% as Coloured or Mixed, 15.4% as Black, and 1.2% as unknown or other. Students were recruited from psychology, other social sciences and arts departments (70.8%), sciences (21.7%), joint programmes (6.9%), and unknown subjects (0.6%).

Design and Procedure

A 3 (country: PL, SA and the UK) x 2 (participants' sex: male vs. female) between-subjects design was adopted where dependent variables included hostile and benevolent sexism².

Individuals participated in small groups. Each individual was provided with a booklet containing an information sheet with a cover story (i.e., that the study involved measurement validation), a consent form, the ASI (Glick and Fiske 1996), and a debriefing note which explained the real purpose of the study. The session took approximately 30 minutes. The study received necessary institutional ethical approval. British Psychological Society's ethical guidelines were adhered to at all times including that informed consent was obtained from all participants.

Measures

Glick and Fiske's (1996) ASI was used to measure sexist attitudes toward women. This tool contains a six-point Likert-type response format (0-disagree strongly, 5-agree strongly), where half of the 22 items measure hostile and the other half measure benevolent sexism (HS and BS respectively), and higher scores indicate higher sexism. Evidence for the ASI's discriminant and convergent validity has been provided by Glick and Fiske (1996), for its cross-national validity by Glick *et al.* (2000), and for its convergent and divergent validity in

² For the interdisciplinary reader: 3x2 between subject design refers to a research design where 6 groups (3x2=6) of different people (hence 'between subject') are compared on a given measured variable (called dependent variable - here level of sexism). This format contains information about the number of factors (here two: country and participants' sex) on which the measured scores may depend and the number of levels each factor is represented by (here 3 countries and 2 sexes). Interested readers may find more information about research designs in Richardson, Goodwin and Vine (2011).

British samples by Masser and Abrams (1999)³. The scale was administered in English in SA and the UK, and translated into Polish. The Polish translation was back-translated into English, and any ambiguities in the translation were resolved through discussion (see Appendix 1 for the Polish translation). Items 4 and 8 were removed from the respective HS and BS scales due to low item-total correlations, after which satisfactory reliability coefficients were obtained.⁴

Results

Overview of the Data

As Table I illustrates, participants' mean scores ranged from 1.98 to 2.81 for HS and from 2.05 to 3.07 for BS which indicates relatively low to moderate endorsement of sexism in the

³ For the interdisciplinary reader: validity of a scale (or of a measurement tool) refers to an assessment of whether the scale measures what it was designed to measure (e.g., sexism and not racism). Support for discriminant (or divergent) validity is obtained if the measure does not correlate with (returns different scores than) a measure of an unrelated concept. Convergent validity is the opposite : Evidence for it is obtained if the measure in question correlates with a different measure of the same or similar concept (see Howitt and Cramer, 2011).

⁴ The data was tested using recognized methods in this field: A reliability analysis was carried out for both HS and BS scales using Cronbach's Alpha test. The test assesses how well the scale measures what it is designed to measure (i.e., sexism) by examining its internal consistency (i.e., if responses to each statement/item on the scale are related). Low item-total correlations indicate that a given item/statement generates responses which do not relate well to the remaining items. Satisfactory Cronbach's Alpha scores emerged for each country in the current study for both HS ($\alpha_{PL} = .79$, $\alpha_{SA} = .83$, and $\alpha_{UK} = .84$) and BS ($\alpha_{PL} = .75$, $\alpha_{SA} = .75$ and $\alpha_{UK} = .72$) (see Field, 2009).

three samples. The scores in the UK are only slightly higher than those reported by Glick *et al.* (2000, P. Glick, personal communication, Oct 4, 2011) whilst in the case of SA scores are lower than those previously reported.⁵ This indicates potential temporal changes in SA and the UK with attitudes becoming slightly less sexist in the former and somewhat more sexist in the latter.⁶

Preliminary Analyses

In order to test cross-national construct equivalence a replicatory factor analysis was conducted following Ben-Porath's (1990) recommendation. Factorial solutions confirmed the original HM and BM factors in each country providing evidence for invariance.⁷

⁵ The means for the UK in our study were as follows: for HS $M_F=1.76$ vs. $M_M=2.13$ and for BS

$M_F=1.92$ vs. $M_M=2.02$ while our means for SA were as follows: for HS $M_F=2.41$ vs. $M_M=3.44$ and for BS $M_F=3.45$ vs. $M_M=3.20$.

⁶ Although more recent data sets exist, these, unfortunately, are not comparable to those of Glick *et al.*'s (2000). For example, Viki and Abrams's (2003) report more recent findings concerning the UK, and Forbes *et al.* (2004) for Polish females but these authors adopted modified HS and BS subscales with seven-point, as opposed to the original six-point, response format.

⁷ Construct equivalence (i.e., referring to whether the concept of sexism is understood and functions in the same way in all three countries) is operationally defined as factorial or metric invariance. This is tested through replicatory factor analysis – a statistical procedure which assesses if the responses to the items/statements in a given scale cluster around a number of a priori identified factors in the same way as in the original scale. Here existence of two factors (i.e., benevolent and hostile sexism) was assumed and confirmed. Level of similarity between the obtained factorial solutions (i.e., clusters of items) from each country was also assessed: Tucker's (1951) phi coefficient of congruence indicated that Polish and South African factors were highly similar to

1 **Main Analysis –**

2 The interdisciplinary reader may wish to advance to the section below entitled ‘Analysis
 3 summary’. Multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was conducted by country and
 4 gender for both measures of sexism (HS and BS). Levene’s test revealed no significant
 5 differences in variance for HS and BS. The multivariate test statistic using Pillai’s trace
 6 indicated that there were significant main effects of country, $V=.14$, $F(4, 844)=15.824$,
 7 $p<.001$, and sex, $V=.044$, $F(2, 421)=9.751$, $p<.001$, but no Country x Sex interaction effect,
 8 $V=.007$, $F(4, 844)=.727$, $p=.574$, on both types of sexism. Separate univariate ANOVAs on
 9 the outcome variables are reported below. Descriptive statistics are reported in Table 1.

10 *Comparison of Three Countries on Hostile and Benevolent Sexism.* Hypothesis 1a was
 11 confirmed: The follow-up analysis for the significant main country effect on HS,
 12 $F(2,427)=11.612$, $p<.001$, $\eta^2_p=.052$, revealed that both Polish ($M=2.71$) and South African
 13 ($M=2.41$) students rated significantly higher on HS than British ones ($M=2.16$, $p<.001$ and
 14 $p<.05$ respectively). Moreover, Polish students also scored significantly higher than the South
 15 African ones ($p<.01$) confirming H1c.

16 Hypotheses 1b and 1d predicted similar pattern for BS which was confirmed: The follow-
 17 up for the significant main country effect on BS, $F(2,427)=30.633$, $p<.001$, $\eta^2_p=.127$,
 18 indicated that Polish ($M=3.01$) and South African ($M=2.63$) samples both rated significantly
 19 higher on BS than the British sample ($M=2.20$, both $p<.001$). Moreover, PL and SA also
 20 differed significantly from each other ($p<.001$) with PL scoring as more benevolently sexist
 21 than SA.

the British ones exceeding the recommended cut off point of .90 (Tucker 1951): .94 for HS in SA,
 .93 for BS in SA, .95 for HS in PL, and .91 for BS in PL (see Ben-Porath, 1990) .

1 *Testing Gender Differences across Countries.* In line with Hypotheses 2a a significant main
 2 effect of sex on HS revealed that women rated lower on HS ($M=2.24$) than men ($M=2.61$),
 3 $F(1,422)=17.601, p<.001, \eta^2_p=.04$. This effect was not qualified by a Country x Sex
 4 interaction effect, $F(2,422)=1.159, p>.1, \eta^2_p=.005$ (see Figure 1).

5 To test Hypotheses 2b, 2c and 2d both main effect of sex and Country x Sex
 6 interaction were calculated for BS. The main effect of sex reached significance,
 7 $F(1,422)=6.58, p<.05, \eta^2_p=.015$. Women scored lower on BS ($M=2.51$) than men ($M=2.72$).
 8 However, contrary to our predictions, this main effect was not qualified by a Country x Sex
 9 interaction, $F(2,422)=.372, p>.1, \eta^2_p=.002$, indicating that this gender difference was not
 10 restricted to the relatively liberal UK (as predicted by H2c), but held also for more
 11 conservative SA and PL (contradicting H2b and H2d respectively, see Figure 2).

12 — Insert Table I about here —

13 — Insert Figures 1 and 2 about here —

14 *Analysis summary for interdisciplinary readers*

15 Statistical analysis was conducted in order to determine whether differences in hostile and
 16 benevolent scores between the three countries, two genders, or any combination of these,
 17 were significant and in the predicted direction. This analysis revealed that the level of both
 18 types of sexism differed significantly as a function of country. Specifically, irrespective of
 19 their gender, both Polish and South African students scored as significantly more hostile-
 20 sexist than British ones in accordance with hypothesis 1a. Moreover, hypothesis 1c was also
 21 confirmed through the finding that Polish students scored as significantly more hostile-sexist
 22 than South African ones; again, irrespective of their gender. The same pattern was found for
 23 benevolent sexism and therefore offered support for hypotheses 1b and 1d.

24 The analysis also revealed that level of both types of sexism differed significantly as a

function of participant's gender. That is to say, irrespective of their nationality, women scored as less hostile-sexist than men in accordance with hypothesis 2a. However, women also scored as significantly less benevolent-sexist than men across all three countries. This was a pattern that we predicted only for the relatively liberal UK. Thus, while hypothesis 2c was supported, hypotheses 2b and 2d were not.

Discussion

The main aim of this study was to address the dearth of cross-national research concerning the manifestation of ambivalent sexism in two under-researched transitional countries – PL and SA – and to compare them to the well-researched and socio-economically stable UK. Our analysis uniquely considers how the countries' history of transition might influence sexism, and in doing so, goes beyond the predictions of current theories such as AST and modernization theories. The answers to our two key research questions are discussed below.

Benevolent and hostile attitudes toward women in PL, SA and the UK

In line with our predictions, Polish and South African students were more hostile- and benevolent-sexist than British students. This finding lends support to AST's contention that the two types of sexism act as complementary ideologies (Glick 2001). It also largely replicates cross-national findings that compare SA and the UK (Glick *et al.* 2000). Yet it would appear there have been slight changes over time: While South African scores show higher egalitarianism, the British scores indicate somewhat less egalitarianism. This trend in SA is consistent with the notion that modernisation leads to greater gender-egalitarianism (Inglehart and Norris 2003). The potential decline of gender-egalitarianism in the UK, while concerning, finds support in literature on the return of sexism to the UK (Crompton *et al.* 2005, Braun and Scott 2009, Walter 2010)

Comparative findings from PL and SA are not only unique but also interesting. These countries have both undergone dramatic socio-economic transition over the last 20 years. Modernisation theories would thus suggest similar level of progress towards egalitarianism (Inglehart and Norris 2003). AST on the other hand assumes biological and social roots of HS and BS and is underspecified with regards to predictions concerning cross-cultural levels of ambivalent sexism. However, our findings show that the two countries did differ significantly, with PL scoring as more gender-conservative on both types of sexism. These findings confirmed our predictions based on the historical specificities of transition in each country. We argued that since gender issues were placed at the centre of the democratisation debates in SA (Andrews 2001, Jagwanth and Murray 2002, Hassim 2002, 2004) this facilitated the development of a vibrant and effective feminist movement in that country and promoted increased gender egalitarianism in SA. Unlike SA, gender issues were marginalised in democratisation debates in PL, due to conscious distancing from the forced ‘emancipation’ of the communist system (LaFont 2001), which led to the remasculinisation of society (LaFont 2001, Pollert 2003, Yakushko 2005, Seguino 2007) and lack of support for gender equality.

While further research is needed to investigate the direct links between socio-political factors and ambivalent sexism, our findings point toward the importance of policy development in shaping gender attitudes at a national level. As illustrated here, such an analysis may be useful in extending the scope of current theories.

Gender difference in sexism in PL, UK and SA

Findings concerning HS confirmed our prediction: irrespective of country, men outscored women. While this finding is consistent with reported cross-national patterns (Glick *et al.* 2000) it also supports the AST’s contention that men and women have different motivations in endorsing or rejecting HS. In other words, irrespective of the level of sexism in any

country, endorsing HS protects male group interests and dominance (Sibley *et al.* 2007b). Rejecting HS, on the other hand, protects female in-group interests against the negative evaluation of their gender group (Glick and Fiske 1996). Our findings also demonstrate, for the first time, that this pattern holds for PL. They are incongruent, however, with Ukrainian findings where women were not found to differ from men on HS (Yakushko 2005). Yet these are of limited comparability as the ASI was administered to Ukrainian students in English. Further research could fruitfully investigate variations in gender differences within these, and other CEE countries.

Our predictions for BS were partially confirmed. Men's greater endorsement of BS held not only in the egalitarian UK but also in PL as well as SA. While our findings for SA and PL contradict our predictions and earlier findings reported in Glick *et al.* (2000) about SA, they do not necessarily challenge AST. It is possible that the level of egalitarianism in SA and PL, although lower than that in the UK, is sufficient to motivate men to endorse BS (as the only means of maintain the status quo) by already making hostility to women socially unacceptable. Indeed, in absolute terms, our scores indicate relatively low endorsement of sexist attitudes in all three samples. Moreover, compared to Glick *et al.*'s (2000) relatively dated findings, this study suggests potential movement toward greater egalitarianism in SA. A number of interesting questions therefore emerge. At what level does egalitarianism start motivating men to embrace BS, and further, at what level, if at all, does egalitarianism result in rejecting both types of sexism among men and women? Answers to these questions are important in order to understand the process of gender attitude liberalization and might inform future policy development.

Novel Polish findings also illustrate a pattern typical of gender egalitarian countries (Glick *et al.* 2000): Although this sample scored as the most gender-conservative of the three, men outscored women on both HS and BS and their absolute scores were fairly egalitarian.

1 This pattern differs, however, from Yakushko's (2005) findings obtained from the Ukraine
2 where women outscored men on BS. Such a score is more typical for gender conservative
3 country and indeed the means reported by Yakushko (2005) are higher for both types of
4 sexism than those reported in the current study for PL. More research is needed to gain a
5 fuller picture of how Eastern European countries score on ambivalent sexism, how they
6 compare to each other as well as to Western countries, how their particular socio-economic
7 histories interact with these attitudes, and whether their attitudes change over time during and
8 post transition.

9 Whilst choice of student samples is a common practice, as it helps to increase
10 comparability of findings across countries, it also compromises the generalisability of the
11 findings outside the student population. It is possible that other, older, or less educated, social
12 groups in each country are less gender egalitarian than our samples (Phinney and Flores
13 2002, Swim *et al.* 2005, Scott 2006, Dorius and Alwin 2010). Moreover, the self-report
14 measures used in this study may have returned optimistically liberal scores. Although most
15 recent scales with improved psychometric properties were used (Swim *et al.* 2005), they may
16 still be prone to social desirability effects (Nelson 2002). Even though we made use of a
17 cover story designed to mitigate possible social desirability effects, in order to address this
18 issue directly, the use of both implicit and explicit measures of gender attitudes is
19 recommended in further studies (for example, Implicit Associations Test, Greenwald and
20 Banaji 1995, Rudman and Kilianski 2000, Lane *et al.* 2007).

21 This study contributes toward our current body of knowledge by comparing
22 ambivalent sexism to women in transitional PL and SA as well as in the UK directly for the
23 first time. It also goes beyond current theory by emphasizing that the manifestation of sexism
24 may, to some extent at least, depend upon histories of transition. It also stressed the
25 importance of policy development which, as the current analysis has shown, has clear

potential to bring about real change towards egalitarianism. Future investigations need to include more countries undergoing transition in order to further our understanding of the manifestation of ambivalent sexism in them.

Acknowledgments

We would like to thank the University of Winchester for sponsoring this research through a Research and Knowledge Transfer Grant. We would also like to express our gratitude to the University of Gdansk in Poland and the University of Cape Town, SA, for their cooperation. Last, but not least, our thanks go to Dr Blu Tirohl and the anonymous reviewers for their helpful comments on earlier version of this manuscript.

References

- Andrews, P.E., 2001. From gender apartheid to non-sexism: the pursuit of women's rights in South Africa. *North Carolina Journal of International Law and Commercial Regulation*, 26, 693-722.
- Barreto, M. & Ellemers, N., 2005. The burden of benevolent sexism: how it contributes to the maintenance of gender inequalities. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 35 (5), 633-642.
- Becker, J.C., 2010. Why do women endorse hostile and benevolent sexism? The role of salient female subtypes and internalization of sexist contents. *Sex Roles*, 62, 453-467.
- Ben-Porath, Y.S., 1990. Cross-cultural assessment of personality: the case for replicatory factor analysis. In: J.N. Butcher & C.D. Spielberger, eds. *Advances in personality assessment*. NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc., 27-48.
- Bhana, A., Zimmerman, R. & Cupp, P., 2008. Gender role attitudes and sexual risk among adolescents in South Africa. *Vulnerable Children and Youth Studies*, 3, 112-119.
- Blau, F.D., Brinton, M.C. & Grusky, D.B., 2006. *The declining significance of gender?* New York: Russell Sage.
- Brandt, M. J. & Henry, P. 2012. Gender inequality and gender differences in authoritarianism. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 38(10), 1301-1315.
- Braun, M. & Scott, J., 2009. Gender-role egalitarianism—is the trend reversal real? *International Journal of Public Opinion Research*, 21 (3), 362-367.
- Burgess, S. M. & Steenkamp, J. E. M. 1999. Value priorities and consumer behavior in a transitional economy: a case of South Africa. In: R. Batra, ed., *Marketing issues in transitional economies*. Boston: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1-42.
- Cameron, N., 2003. Physical growth in a transitional economy: the aftermath of South African apartheid. *Economic Human Biology*, 1 (1), 29-42.
- Crompton, R., Brockmann, M. & Lyonette, C., 2005. Attitudes, women's employment and the domestic division of labour: a cross-national analysis of two waves. *Work, Employment & Society*, 19 (2), 213-233.
- Dorius, S.F. & Alwin, D.F., 2010. *The global development of egalitarian beliefs—a decomposition of trends in the nature and structure of gender ideology*. Michigan.
- Falke, M., 2002. *Community interests: An insolvency objective in transition economies?* Frankfurt: Frankfurt Institute fuer Transformationsstudien.
- Field, A. 2009. *Discovering statistics using SPSS*. London: SAGE Publications Ltd.

- 1 Forbes, G.B., *et al.*, 2004. Association of the thin body ideal, ambivalent sexism, and self-
2 esteem with body acceptance and the preferred body size of college women in Poland
3 and the United States. *Sex Roles*, 50 (5/6), 331-345.
- 4 Frieze, I.H., *et al.*, 2003. Gender-role attitudes in university students in the United States,
5 Slovenia, and Croatia. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 27, 256-261.
- 6 Gibbons, L.J., Stiles, D.A. & Shokodriani, G.M., 1991. Adolescents' attitudes toward family
7 and gender roles: An international comparison. *Sex Roles*, 25, 625-643.
- 8 Glick, P. & Fiske, S.T., 1996. The ambivalent sexism inventory: Differentiating hostile and
9 benevolent sexism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 70 (3), 491-512.
- 10 Glick, P. & Fiske, S.T., 2001. An ambivalent alliance: Hostile and benevolent sexism as
11 complementary justifications for gender inequality. *American Psychologist*, 56 (2),
12 109.
- 13 Glick, P., *et al.*, 2004. Bad but bold: ambivalent attitudes toward men predict gender
14 inequality in 16 nations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 86 (5), 713-
15 728.
- 16 Glick, P., *et al.*, 2000. Beyond prejudice as simple antipathy: hostile and benevolent sexism
17 across cultures. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 79 (5), 765-775.
- 18 Grodsky, B., 2011. When pro-democracy organizations take power: what Poland and South
19 Africa should have told us about Georgia. Retrieved from
20 [http://www.wilsoncenter.org/event/when-pro-democracy-organizations-take-power-](http://www.wilsoncenter.org/event/when-pro-democracy-organizations-take-power-what-poland-and-south-africa-should-have-told-us)
21 [what-poland-and-south-africa-should-have-told-us](http://www.wilsoncenter.org/event/when-pro-democracy-organizations-take-power-what-poland-and-south-africa-should-have-told-us)
- 22 Hassim, S., 2002. 'A conspiracy of women': the women's movement in South Africa's
23 transition to democracy. *Social Research*, 69, 693-732.
- 24 Hassim, S., 2004. A virtuous circle? Gender equality and representation in South Africa. *In*:
25 J. Daniel, R. Southall & J. Lutchman, eds. *State of the nation 2004 - 2005*. Cape
26 Town: HSRC Press, 336-359.
- 27 Hassim, S., 2005. Nationalism displaced: Citizenship discourses in transition. *In*: A. Gouws,
28 ed. *(un)thinking citizenship: feminist debates in contemporary South Africa*. Cape
29 Town: University of Cape Town Press, 55-69.
- 30 Howitt, D. & Cramer, D. 2011. *Introduction to research methods in psychology*. Harlow:
31 Pearson Education Limited.
- 32 Inglehart, R. & Norris, P., 2003. Introduction: explaining the rising tide of gender equality.
33 *In*: R. Inglehart & P. Norris, eds. *Rising tide: gender equality and cultural change*
34 *around the world*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1-28.

- 1 Jackman, M.R., 1994. *The velvet glove: paternalism and conflict in gender, class and race*
2 *relations* Berkeley: University of California Press.
- 3 Jagwanth, S. & Murray, C., 2002. Ten years of transformation: how has gender equality in
4 South Africa fared? *Canadian Journal of Women and the Law*, 14, 255-299.
- 5 Kalichman, S.C., *et al.*, 2007. Sexual assault, sexual risks and gender attitudes in a
6 community sample of South African men. *AIDS Care*, 19, 20- 27.
- 7 Ksiniewicz, M., 2004. Specyfika polskiego feminizmu. [specificity of Polish feminism].
8 *Kultura i Historia*, 6, 90-100.
- 9 Lafont, S., 2001. One step forward, two steps back: women in the post-communist states.
10 *Communist and Post-Communist Studies*, 34 (2), 203-220.
- 11 Levant, R.F., *et al.*, 2003. Masculinity ideology among Russian and U.S. young men and
12 women and its relationship to unhealthy lifestyle habits among young Russian men.
13 *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, 4 (1), 26-36.
- 14 Masser, B. & Abrams, D., 1999. Contemporary sexism: the relationships among hostility,
15 benevolence, and neosexism. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 23, 503-517.
- 16 Mcdaniel, A.E., 2008. Measuring gender egalitarianism: the attitudinal differences between
17 men and women. *International Journal of Sociology*, 38 (1), 58-80.
- 18 Olson, J., *et al.*, 2007. Beliefs in equality for women and men as related to economic factors
19 in central and eastern Europe and the United States. *Sex Roles*, 56 (5-6), 297-308.
- 20 Phinney, J.S. & Flores, J., 2002. 'Unpackaging' acculturation: aspects of acculturation as
21 predictors of traditional sex role attitudes. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 33,
22 320-331.
- 23 Pollert, A., 2003. Women, work and equal opportunities in post-communist transition. *Work,*
24 *Employment & Society*, 17 (2), 331-357.
- 25 Prewitt-Freilino, J. L., Caswell, T. A. & Laakso, E. K. 2012. The gendering of language: A
26 comparison of gender equality in countries with gendered, natural gender, and
27 genderless languages. *Sex Roles*, 66, 1-14.
- 28 Richardson, P., Goodwin, A. & Vine, E. 2011. *Research methods and design in psychology.*
29 Exeter: Learning Matters Ltd.
- 30 Robila, M. & Krishnakumar, A., 2004. The role of children in Eastern European families.
31 *Children & Society Volume*, 18, 30-41.
- 32 Rosner, K., 1997. Czy istnieje w polsce ruch feministyczny? [does the feminist movement
33 exist in poland?]. *Pełnym Glosem* (5), 13-27.
- 34 Scott, J., 2006. *Family and gender roles: how attitudes are changing:* Network, G.E.

- 1 Seguino, S., 2007. Plus ça change? Evidence on global trends in gender norms and
2 stereotypes. *Feminist Economics*, 13 (2), 1-28.
- 3 Shafiro, M.V., Himelein, M.J. & Best, D.L., 2003. Ukrainian and U.S. American females:
4 Differences in individualism/collectivism and gender attitudes. *Journal of Cross-*
5 *Cultural Psychology*, 34 (3), 297-303.
- 6 Sibley, C.G., Overall, N.C. & Duckitt, J., 2007a. When women become more hostilely sexist
7 toward their gender: The system-justifying effect of benevolent sexism. *Sex Roles*, 57
8 (9), 743-754.
- 9 Sibley, C.G., *et al.*, 2009. Your sexism predicts my sexism: perceptions of men's (but not
10 women's) sexism affects one's own sexism over time. *Sex Roles*, 60 (9), 682-693.
- 11 Sibley, C.G. & Perry, R., 2010. An opposing process model of benevolent sexism. *Sex Roles*,
12 62, 438-452.
- 13 Sibley, C.G., Wilson, M.S. & Duckitt, J., 2007b. Antecedences of men's hostile and
14 benevolent sexism: the dual roles of social dominance orientation and right-wing
15 authoritarianism. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 33 (2), 160-172.
- 16 Smith, P.B. & Bond, M.H., 1999. Culture: the neglected concept. In: P.B. Smith & M.H.
17 Bond, eds. *Social psychology across cultures: analysis and perspectives*. Boston:
18 Allyn & Bacon, 38-69.
- 19 Swim, J.K. & Campbell, B., 2003. Sexism: attitudes, beliefs, and behaviors. In: R. Brown &
20 S. Gaerthner, eds. *Blackwell handbook of social psychology - intergroup processes*.
21 Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 218-237.
- 22 Swim, J.K., *et al.*, 2005. Judgments of sexism: a comparison of the subtlety of sexism
23 measures and sources of variability in judgments of sexism. *Psychology of Women*
24 *Quarterly*, 29, 406-411.
- 25 Tougas, F., *et al.*, 1995. Neosexism: plus ça change, plus c'est pareil. *Personality and Social*
26 *Psychology Bulletin*, 21, 842-849.
- 27 Tucker, L.R., 1951. *A method for synthesis of factor analysis studies* Washington, D.C.:
28 Department of the Army.
- 29 Twenge, J.M., 2001. Changes in women's assertiveness in response to status and roles: a
30 cross-temporal meta-analysis, 1931-1933. *Journal of Personality and Social*
31 *Psychology*, 81 (1), 133-145.
- 32 United nations development programme HDR 2009. Overcoming barriers: human mobility
33 and development. Basingstoke

- 1 Viki, G.T. & Abrams, D., 2003. Infra-humanization: ambivalent sexism and the attribution of
2 primary and secondary emotions to women. *Journal of Experimental Social*
3 *Psychology*, 39 (5), 492-499.
- 4 Viki, G.T. & Abrams, D., 2004. Hostile and benevolent sexism: complementary system
5 justifying ideologies. *Social Psychological Review*, 6 (2), 76-88.
- 6 Wall, S.N., *et al.*, 1999. Gender role and religion as predictors of attitude toward abortion in
7 Croatia, Slovenia, the Czech Republic, and the United States. *Journal of Cross-*
8 *Cultural Psychology*, 30, 443-465.
- 9 Walter, N., 2010. *Living dolls, the return of sexism*. London: Virago Press Ltd.
- 10 Williams, J.E. & Best, D.L., 1982. *Measuring sex stereotypes: a thirty-nation study*. Beverly
11 Hills: CA: Sage.
- 12 Williams, J.E. & Best, D.L., 1990. *Measuring sex stereotypes: a multination study*. Beverly
13 Hills: CA: Sage.
- 14 Williams, J.E., Satterwhite, R.C. & Best, D.L., 1999. Pancultural gender stereotypes
15 revisited: the five factor model. *Sex Roles: A Journal of Research*, 40 (7/8), 513-525.
- 16 Yakushko, O., 2005. Ambivalent sexism and relationship patterns among women and men in
17 Ukraine. *Sex Roles*, 52 (9/10), 586-596.

1 List of captions for illustrations:

2 Figure 1: Hostile Sexism as a Function of Country and Participants' Sex

3 Figure 2: Benevolent Sexism as a Function of Country and Participants' Sex

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Appendix 1

2 Polish translation of the Ambivalent Sexism Scale by Glick and Fiske (1996).

Określ swoje odczucia dotyczące każdego z podanych stwierdzeń

stwierdzenie	zupełnie się nie zgadzam	w jakimś stopniu się nie zgadzam	w małym stopniu się nie zgadzam	w małym stopniu się zgadzam	w jakimś stopniu się zgadzam	zgadzam się całkowicie
1. Mężczyzna, bez względu jak wiele osiągnął, nie jest całkowicie spełniony jako osoba jeżeli nie jest kochany przez kobietę.	0	1	2	3	4	5
2. Tak na prawdę wiele kobiet zabiega o specjalne względy, na przykład wykorzystując zasady mające na celu przyniesienie korzyści im a nie mężczyznom, pod pretekstem "równouprawnienia".	0	1	2	3	4	5
3. W przypadku katastrofy, niekoniecznie powinno się ratować kobiety w pierwszej kolejności, przed mężczyznami.	0	1	2	3	4	5
4. Większość kobiet interpretuje niewinne uwagi czy uczynki jako seksistowskie.	0	1	2	3	4	5
5. Kobiety za szybko się obrażają.	0	1	2	3	4	5
6. Ludzie są często naprawdę szczęśliwi w życiu bez romantycznego zaangażowania w osobę przeciwnej płci.	0	1	2	3	4	5
7. Feministki nie dążą do uzyskania większej władzy dla kobiet niż dla mężczyzn.	0	1	2	3	4	5
8. Wiele kobiet posiada cechę moralnej czystości, którą posiada niewiele mężczyzn.	0	1	2	3	4	5
9. Kobiety powinny być otaczane troską i chronione przez mężczyzn.	0	1	2	3	4	5
10. Większość kobiet nie docenia w pełni wszystkiego co robią dla nich mężczyźni.	0	1	2	3	4	5
11. Kobiety starają się zdobyć władzę przez uzyskanie kontroli nad mężczyznami.	0	1	2	3	4	5
12. Każdy mężczyzna powinien mieć kobietę, którą uwielbia.	0	1	2	3	4	5
13. Mężczyźni nie potrzebują kobiet by czuć się spełnieni.	0	1	2	3	4	5
14. Kobiety wyolbrzymiają problemy, które mają w pracy.	0	1	2	3	4	5
15. Kiedy już kobieta zdobędzie mężczyznę, zwykle próbuje krótko go trzymać.	0	1	2	3	4	5
16. Kiedy kobiety przegrywają z mężczyznami w sprawiedliwej rywalizacji, zwykle skarżą się że są dyskryminowane.	0	1	2	3	4	5
17. Dobra kobieta powinna być stawiana na piedestale przez swojego mężczyznę.	0	1	2	3	4	5
18. Tak na prawdę bardzo niewiele kobiet czerpie satysfakcję prowokując mężczyzn seksualnie po to tylko by potem odrzucić ich załoty.	0	1	2	3	4	5
19. W porównaniu z mężczyznami, kobiety mają większą wrażliwość moralną.	0	1	2	3	4	5
20. Mężczyźni powinni chętnie poświęcić swój własny dobrobyt na rzecz finansowego utrzymania swoich kobiet.	0	1	2	3	4	5
21. Feministki zgłaszają całkowicie uzasadnione wymagania w stosunku do mężczyzn.	0	1	2	3	4	5
22. W porównaniu z mężczyznami, kobiety mają bardziej wyrafinowane wyczucie kultury i dobry gust.	0	1	2	3	4	5